DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 283 JC 770 123

AUTHOR Arter, Margaret H.
TITLE A Grants Planning and Management System for a Multi-Unit Community College District.
PUB DATE 23 Feb 77
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the California Association for Institutional Research (San Diego, California, February 23, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Centralization; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Decision Making; Educational Development; *Grants; *Junior Colleges; *Management Systems; *Multicampus Districts; *Program Design; Program Planning; Project Applications; School Surveys; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS Cuyahoga Community College

ABSTRACT

Cuyahoga Community College, a multi-campus institution, sought to develop and design a grants planning and management system to coordinate funds of both an internal and external nature earmarked for instructional research, planning, and development. Objectives were to create a system accessible to all professionals on all campuses, to provide a simplified system for funding of educational development activities, and to make provision for a uniform system of management for all grants whether funded externally or internally. District-level personnel, without benefit of individual campus or faculty input, established priorities for a grants system which included centralized control, uniformity of program management, establishment of a proper accounting system, better fiscal control, and articulation of campus components of the system. A grant proposal submission subsystem was established following these criteria. An evaluation of the subsystem was conducted to determine administrative and user response to its provisions through a survey of selected users and support services personnel. Of 95 faculty-administrators and support services personnel surveyed, only 28% responded. Results showed that users were not confident about the system. User input in system revision was recommended. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A GRANTS PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR A MULTI-UNIT COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

A Paper Presented to

California Association for Institutional Research

1977 Annual Conference

February 23, 1977 - Section C

San Diego, California

by

Margaret H. Arter
Director of Grants Planning and Management
Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio

JC 770 123

BACKGROUND

In order to better understand the need for a grants planning and management system at Cuyahoga Community College, it is necessary to understand the institution and its development since inception.

Institution

Cuyahoga Community College is one of four Ohio community colleges. It is a multi-unit district in an urban area of two million. It serves the County of Cuyahoga, the eighth largest county in population in the Nation, encompassing the city of Cleveland and suburban areas. It has three campuses, Eastern, Western, and Metropolitan, serving diverse populations. It has a district headcount of approximately 28,000, and a district FTE of over 15,000.

Need for Planning

Founded in 1962, the College grew rapidly during the 1960's and 1970's. Unlike some segments of higher education and even some community colleges, it continued to experience growth in enrollment in the academic years 1975-76 and 1976-77. However growth did not guarantee increased revenues from the State of Ohio, from which approximately one-half of its revenues were supplied. Growth beyond the allocated state-reimbursed subsidy for FTE's did not produce additional revenue. Both national and regional population projections for Ohio during the 1980's did not predict increased enrollments, but rather declining ones. Thus the competition for funds would be keen, and the need for developing planning for the 1980's was seen to be crucial. A Master Plan process was begun early in 1975. Planning and evaluating techniques were needed for all instructional and service activities, as well as support services attached to these areas.

College-wide activities which were determined to be critical to the College's Plan of Advancement were the following: 1) updating of the College's policies and procedures, 2) completion of the educational master plan, 3) improvement of the College's computer system and its student registration and records system, and 4) improvement of the College's administrative organizational structure. As part of the changes in the planning, management, and operational support functions of educational planning and development, the Office of Grants Planning and Management, based in the district administration, became responsible for designing and coordinating a College-wide process for grants planning, application, management, evaluation, and reporting. The Office was to assist in diversifying and strengthening the resource base of the College.

While campus autonomy had been marked in the past, with the strengthening of the district organization related to the College's plan of advancement, the grants and contracts area could no longer operate without centrally coordinated structure. Although the Office had been in existence for a decade, under the guidance of several directors, it had not provided a uniform system for instructional and service grants.

Grants Program

The purpose of the grants program at Cuyahoga Community College is to stimulate and encourage instructional research and improvement in its educational program and to extend and enhance its service program to the community.

- To develop and provide a simplified, coordinated system of funding for instructional and professional development activities within the College.
- To seek funding for educational and professional staff development activities in a system which is easily accessible to all professional college colleagues.
- To encourage participation by support staff, faculty, librarians, and administrators at all levels within the College.

- To engage in educational developmental activities.

The coordinated grants system at the College correlates and coordinates funds of both an internal and external nature which are earmarked for instructional research, planning, and development. The coordinated grants system deals with resources, both human and fiscal, which are restricted for such activities. Internal funds refer to those derived from state appropriations, local levies, and tuition payments. External funds refer to those derived from governmental grants and contracts, private foundations, and corporate and individual grants and gifts.

THE PROBLEM

The problem was to determine how to develop and design a grants planning and management system which was an integral part of the educational and financial management systems of the College. The Office of Grants Planning and Management sought to determine:

1. What were the priorities of a multi-unit district in planning and managing for external funding through grants and contracts?
2. How could a workable procedural structure be developed for faculty and staff to meet local campus needs?

The coordinated grants planning and management system would have to encompass the following objectives inherent in its structure:

- To provide information and consultation to individuals and units within the College campus community for the purpose of developing effective developmental activities in accord with the goals and mission of the College and the campuses.
- To provide a simplified system for funding for educational staff development activities.
- To provide a system which is accessible to all professional colleagues on all campuses.
- To plan and make provision for a uniform system of management for all grants whether funded externally or internally.

The objectives of the grants system were based upon the following assumptions:

1. That the community college is concerned about the improvement of teaching and learning.

2. That Cuyahoga Community College wishes to provide maximum flexibility and accessible resources for innovation and experimentation at the campus level to realize the College mission in its educational programs and services.

3. That all support systems of the College, including the coordinated grants system, are formulated to enhance the educational program and community services of the College through teaching and learning.

4. That all program plans and operational plans of the coordinated grants system reflect an open, free, and manageable coordination of human and fiscal resources.

Two further assumptions precluded the process of formulating a grants planning and managing system:

1. Without joint planning and decision-making, it is difficult in a large complex organization like Cuyahoga Community College to obtain an accurate picture of all existing programs and how they relate to the overall mission and purposes of the College and to their sponsoring agencies.

2. The management levels of all segments within the system must be assigned responsibilities for the planning and managing of externally funded projects.

THE PROCESS

While systems planning in its origin through administration may be labeled "executive", it cannot be satisfactorily adapted and implemented on the instructional and service fronts of the institution without complete knowledge of the purposes, objectives, and procedures being made available during planning to faculty and staff. The design of the system illustrated the diverse approaches of the college community segments: that of the planners, the district administration of the college, versus the campus operational units who were classified as users of the system.

The coordinated grants system at the College was under the direction of the district office of the vice chancellor for educational planning and development. Functioning as support staff to this office in educational planning and development were the following offices: Office of Grants Planning and Management, Office of Instructional/ Instructional Staff Development, Office of Educational Resources, Office of Educational Research and Evaluation Services, and Office of Occupational and Career Program Planning and Coordination. These offices served the three campuses of the district. These offices sought specifically to improve and evaluate instruction, strengthen existing programs, mount new programs, revise and combine existing programs, identify internal and external resources for specific needs, and reallocate internal resources to meet ongoing needs.

These offices at the administrative level of the college district met and determined through their directors and other assigned administrative officers the purposes and objectives of a coordinated grants system. No campus or faculty input was solicited at this point in the process.

District administrators were anxious to have a system operational and paid little heed to the philosophy which might undergird policy and procedure. Meeting Federal agency measures of performance for grants and contracts, the accountability factor, appeared to be the primary motivating force in the present regulatory era of management appraisal. The responsibility for the stewardship of public funds prompted the district administration to establish submission and review procedures for sponsored projects. The following priorities were established by the administration:

1) Centralized control
2) Uniformity of management of sponsored programs
3) Establishment of a proper accounting system
4) Better fiscal control
5) Articulation of campus components in an All-College System.

No campus or faculty input was solicited at this point in the process.

The Office of Grants Planning and Management charted its own input and anticipated outcomes. No campus or faculty input was solicted at this point in the process.

Input

- Analysis of funding needs
- Identification of external funding sources
- Contacting funding agencies
- Assisting in preparation of proposal format for external funding
- Assisting in budget preparation
- Managing of submission procedures
- Analysis of proposal review with recommendations for future submission
- Management of award process of funds with assigned campus stewardship
- Assisting accounting operations division with fund expenditure monitoring

- Overseeing reporting requirements of funded programs
- Assisting accounting operations division with fiscal closeout procedures

Anticipated Outcomes

- Funded programs more adaptable to student and faculty needs
- Funded programs adaptable to national and community economic needs
- Funded ongoing programs selectively absorbed by college at expiration
- Improvement of quality of externally funded programs in submission and administration
- Uniform control system of funded programs
- Availability of information on funded programs at all points in system

Design of a System

The Office of Grants Planning and Management in its search for both process and procedures in a designing a grants management system discovered no research related to community colleges. Most management systems related to research-oriented universities. Few procedures manuals were available in two-year institutions, and no information was published on how such procedures were developed in institutions. Only one multi-unit district resource manual was reviewed and it showed weaknesses in procedural organization with only a brief forward on the process utilized in drafting the manual. It was noted that college development officers and district personnel participated in the clarification of the procedures. This manual emanated from a large California community college district.

An exceedingly detailed procedural system in manual form was obtained from a single-college district, also in California, but its forward only briefly categorized the requirements of the system and gave no history of its college development. It was later learned that this system had been developed by an outside consultant, with strong interaction with administrative groups in the college. The result was described by the dean of planning and development as a very workable system.

Thus, the Office of Grants Planning and Management needed to design a system unique to its requirements for the institution and the faculty. If it is determined that the most expeditious funding source for the project developer would be the internal route, then project development and submission would follow the plan for the review and evaluation established by the individual campus. The Campus Based Instructional Grants Program and the District Based Instructional Grants Program guidelines were prepared by the Office of Instructional and Instructional Personnel Development. The project originator then consulted with the local campus instructional grants committee or council chairperson for further details regarding criteria and procedures for review at the campus level.

Development Process of Special Projects for External Funding

In order to carry out an instructional grants program of externally funded projects at Cuyahoga Community College, both pre-award and post-award activities were established which provided for a uniform method of disseminating information to all faculty and staff members for all funding opportunities, a standardized routine for proposal submission, and a set of management procedures of all grant and contract funds received. A three-phase system of proposal submission and development was produced by the Office of Grants Planning and Management. This constituted the Grant Proposal Submission Sub-System (GPSS) in pre-award activity. It also included a pre-award negotiation process if warranted. It included the following:

1.0 Idea Summary and Preliminary Approval (Campus level)

2.0 Preliminary Proposal Development and Approval (Campus and district levels)

3.0 Final Proposal Submission (Primarily district level)

4.0 Pre-acceptance Negotiation and Revision of Proposal (District and campus levels)

Evaluation of Interim Pre-award Procedures

Prior to the availability of a Grants Planning and Management Manual for the College's entire professional staff, both faculty and administration, the Office of Grants Planning and Management conducted a preliminary evaluation of the GPSS by both users and support services. The submission sub-system was put into operation as an interim pre-award procedure at the beginning of 1977 by the College for all campus personnel.

Assumptions. It was assumed by the Director of the Office of Grants Planning and Management that the best qualified persons to evaluate the submission sub-system were present and past users, that is, 1) persons who were directors of active sponsored projects, 2) persons who had been directors of invactive sponsored projects, and 3) administrators at the campus and district levels who were responsible for the approval and administration of sponsored projects. It was also assumed that support service officers of both the campus and district were qualified to evaluate the GPSS as an interim procedure as they were and had been directly involved in proposal planning for externally funded projects.

Design of evaluation. A preliminary evaluation was designed using the survey technique. It attempted to analyze, interpret, and report the present understanding of the GPSS. The survey was utilized to obtain an immediate reaction from present and past users of the system to guide practice in the immediate future.

Population. The respondents in this study were identified as two survey groups: users and support service officers of the district and campuses. They were selected because they were considered best qualified to respond to the preliminary evaluation. They had or were presently involved with grants and contracts in the College. A complete census of the entire professional staff of the College was rejected because many had no knowledge of external

funding procedures and had never utilized the system or indicated interest in utilizing the system.

Survey forms. Data were collected using the two instruments attached: Form A - User Survey and Form B - Support Services Survey. Forms were examined by the Director of Educational Research and Evaluation Services prior incorporation into final documents.

Form A - User Survey. This instrument was directed to project directors, former project directors, campus presidents, campus fiscal officers, deans, assistant deans, selected district directors, district vice chancellors, and the chancellor. The instrument was designed with twenty questions and a space for additional comments. "Yes" - "no" responses were elicited rather than a scale of attitudes because concrete assessments were desired as to the understandability of the process of the GPSS. Because of the responsibility of the stewardship of public funds the assessment of the degree of understanding was not desired. Attitudes toward acceptance of the system were not primarily sought. The questions sequentially led the respondent through the steps of the process. The form was designed to obtain specific suggestions for improvement of the process after a preliminary evaluation.

Form B - Support Services Survey. The second instrument was distributed to the treasurer, selected district directors, and selected campus directors who direct responsibilities to planning of grant and contract proposals. The survey form was designed with ten questions and a space for additional comments. Referred sections of the procedures were listed at the top of the form related to support service officers' responsibilities in the planning process. "Yes" - "no" responses were also elicited. Questions related more specifically to the responsibilities of the respondent rather than to the whole process. The form was also

designed to obtain specific suggestions for improvement of the process after a preliminary evaluation.

Both forms included information on the documents used in the GPSS as well as the identified responsible units and activities.

Hypotheses. Research hypotheses were stated as follows:

1. Users tend to circumvent imposed systems and to create substitute systems which are convenient for their own needs.

2. The higher in the hierarchical organizational structure a user resides the less likely that he/she utilizes the system.

Data Collection

Forms A and B were distributed to respondents through the campus mail with an accompanying memorandum explaining the need for analysis of the interim procedures. A return was requested in two weeks. Follow-up telephone calls were made to respondents to remind them of time-lines. The questionnaires were mailed to 95 respondents, along with a copy of the GPSS Interim Procedures. Form A was forwarded to 62 faculty and administrators termed users, and Form B was mailed to 33 support services personnel at the district administration and on campuses.

The GPSS Interim Procedures numbered 71 pages, some printed on both sides. Although it was a bulky attachment, more than one half of the procedures was an appendix of documents, many of which were already in use at the College in the budget manual and through personnel services. These documents were considered familiar to the users and support service officers. Also included were standard application forms for Federal assistance.

A total of 27 usable returns (28 percent) was received. Responses from support services group for Form B totaled 15 (45 percent) and exceeded

the returns from users for Form A which tallied 12 (19 percent). Survey forms from support services personnel tended to be more complete, with general compliance to the format. Questionnaires from high level administrators were not returned, but instead memoranda were forwarded detailing comments on the system. One assistant dean answered no questions on the user survey form, but wrote in the comment section, "That's some document!" When quieried further by telephone, he responded that it would take him a year to answer those questions intelligently.

Analysis of Data

The numbers of responses to each item on the Form A and Form B questionnaires were summarized. Cross-classifications of responses were disregarded at this point.

FINDINGS

Form A - User Survey

Of the twelve persons responding, three were faculty and nine were administrators. One reply was received from the district administration, six were from the Metropolitan Campus and five from the Western Campus. No attempt was made to cross-classify responses by campus or position.

Responses for this form were grouped in six categories drawn from the questions presented: 1) responsibility of individuals or units, 2) adequacy of time, 3) nature and quality of activities, 4) planning value, 5) adequacy of forms, and 6) funding agency relationships. Aggregate responses were shown in Table 1 which recorded the distribution of frequencies. Not all respondents answered all questions, thus a total and percentages were not included. Written comments by respondents proved helpful to the researcher in focusing on specific areas of concern, but at the same time provided no consensus of reaction of the group.

Table 1

Form A - User Survey Responses

Category of Understanding of Process	Aggregate Frequency "Yes"	Aggregate Frequency "No"
Responsibility of Individuals or Units (Questions 1 to 9)	59	7
Adequacy of Time (Question 10)	4	3
Nature and Quality of Activities (Questions 11 to 13)	15	5
Planning Value (Questions 14 and 15)	8	4
Adequacy of Forms (Questions 16 to 19)	22	0
Funding Agency Relationships (Question 20)	5	1

Summary of Responses to Form A

In summarizing the responses based on Form A - User Survey, the most frequent responses were affirmative, representing an understanding of the sub-system as presented. Adequacy of time represented a category eliciting least agreement whereas adequacy of forms evidenced no disagreement as recorded. Planning value of the system was an area of disagreement.

Form B - Support Services Survey

Of the fifteen persons responding, fourteen were administrators and one was support staff. Eleven replies were received from the district administration, two from the Eastern Campus and two from the Western Campus. There were no responses from the Metropolitan Campus. No attempt was made to cross-classify responses by campus or position.

Responses for this form were grouped in six categories drawn from the questions presented: 1) responsibility of individual or unit, 2) adequacy of time, 3) nature and quality of activities, 4) planning value, 5) adequacy of forms, and 6) participation in planning process. Aggregate responses were shown in Table 2 which delineated the frequency distributions. Because all respondents did not answer all questions, a total and percentages were not included. Questionnaires were considered of value in some instances because of written comments for specific areas of concern.

Summary of Responses to Form B

In summarizing the responses based on Form B - Support Services Survey, there appeared to be less general agreement among respondents. Responses while predominately affirmative showed less evidence of agreement and understanding than with the user group. While the adequacy of forms had elicited complete agreement in those responding in Group A, there was disagreement

Table 2

Form B - Support Services Survey

Category of Understanding of Process	Aggregate Frequency "Yes"	Aggregate Frequency "No"
Responsibility of Individual or Unit (Question 1)	9	6
Adequacy of Time (Question 2)	10	4
Nature and Quality of Activities (Questions 3 to 5)	23	13
Planning Value (Questions 6 and 7)	20	5
Adequacy of Forms (Question 8)	8	4
Participation in Planning Process (Questions 9 and 10)	21	6

within the support services group. One half of respondents to the question did not record that they considered the forms adequate. This group frequently used many of the existing forms, such as the budget preparation forms. More than half of those responding to the questions regarding the nature and quality of the activities did not consider the activities necessary or related to proposal preparation. Almost one third of the support personnel answered questions about participation in the planning process by a negative response.

Written Comments on Form A and Form B

Comments by both users and support service personnel indicated concerns particularly with the following:

1. Timelines and deadlines were problem areas with both faculty and administrators. Earlier notification of deadlines was desired from funding agencies. Faculty members and deans desired less time for approval at campus president level and more time for development of grant proposals.

2. The procedures were too lengthy.

3. It would be difficult to determine if the procedures were workable until a complete run-through had been accomplished once or more.

4. Simple proposals could skip some steps.

5. Faculty and administrators commented on increased bureaucracy, particularly at the district level. These comments were made by campus personnel One dean suggested that the grants planning office should be abolished.

6. Lack of confidence in campus personnel was cited in the approval process

7. The sequence would kill all initiative.

8. Systems never seem to work as planned.

9. The procedures should be re-written as a narrative.

10. There was an insufficient mention of fiscal matters. This comment was made by the assistant treasurer and internal auditor. It was also suggested that the Office of Management and Budget be brought into early planning.

11. Differing opinions from administrators on the complexity of the procedures were received. Some reported them too general, others too specific.

12. The forms provided were a problem area. While some respondents noted a preponderance of forms and documents, others cited a need for new forms such as indirect cost forms, proposal check sheets, preliminary proposal forms, final proposal forms. A new coding system was also suggested.

CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of the data received provided a basis for the following conclusions in relation to the evaluation of the submission sub-system, which was a part of the grants planning and managing system. The purpose of the survey was to analyze, interpret, and report the present understanding of GPSS, and the evaluator concluded the following:

1. An insufficient response was received to draw conclusions about the understanding or lack of understanding of the system.

2. Users and support service officers were not totally confident about use of the system.

3. Acceptance of the system had not been achieved.

4. It was doubtful that complete acceptance of the system, or of any system, formulated at the district level would be completely accepted at the campus level.

5. It was indicated, particularly in comments received, that users would tend to circumvent or short-cut a system, particularly a lengthy one.

6. Top-level district administrators involved in the approval process, surveyed as users, did not indicate an interest in the system, which was evidenced by their lack of participation in the evaluation. This would further indicate a potential lack of utilization of the system.

7. Additional planning was needed at operational levels to achieve a workable system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Cognizant of the findings and conclusions in this evaluation, the following recommendations are made for further study:

1. In order for a workable system for grants planning and management to evolve, there must be early and continuous district and campus planning with both administration and faculty.

2. Users should become planners in order to enhance delivery of instruction and service at the operational level of the institution.

3. A series of evaluations should be undertaken by the College to determine user and support staff acceptance and understanding of the system. One such evaluation should take place at the time of distribution of the whole system to all professional staff, and other periodic evaluations should take place after staff and faculty have fully utilized the system.

4. The system should be a flexible, dynamic design in order to articulate completely the concerns of campus components in a multi-unit college district.

GRANTS PLANNING SUBMISSION SUB-SYSTEM EVALUATION

FORM A - USER SURVEY

Name _____ Location: District ____
Eastern ____
Metro ____
Western ____

Position: Faculty ____
Administrator ____
Support Staff ____

Please read each of the following statements carefully and refer to sections in the attached interim procedures for the submission of grant and contract applications. Mark an "X" by the response that best describes your answer to the question. There are four flow charts for segments of the process. Two DELTA charts indicate the over-all sub-system in summary. Functional responsibility charts detail activities.

		Yes	No
1.	Is the responsibility of the originator clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
2.	Is the responsibility of the unit head clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
3.	Is the responsibility of the dean/pod leader clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
4.	Is the responsibility of the campus president clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
5.	Is the responsibility of Grants Planning and Management clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
6.	Is the responsibility of the Chancellor's Cabinet clearly expressed and defined in the sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
7.	Is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor for Educational Planning and Development clearly expressed and defined in the sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
8.	Is the responsibility of the Accounting Operations Division clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
9.	Is the responsibility of the District Chancellor clearly expressed and defined in this sequence? Comments: _____	___	___
10.	Is the amount of time required to complete the sequence adequate? Comments: _____	___	___
11.	Are all activities in the sequence necessary? Comments: _____	___	___
12.	Are all activities related to the quality of the proposal? Comments: _____	___	___

13. Are any activities in this sequence related only to administration and not to the resultant proposal? Yes No
Comments: _____ ___ ___

14. Is campus-wide planning value apparent in this sequence?
Comments: _____ ___ ___

15. Is district-wide planning value apparent in this sequence?
Comments: _____ ___ ___

16. Is the "Idea Form" an adequate initial planning document?
Comments, suggestions: _____ ___ ___
_____

17. Are Budget Form 28 - Special Project Planning Form-and other attached budget forms adequate for proposal planning documents?
Comments: _____ ___ ___

18. Are the Position Description Questionnaire (PDQ), Position Questionnaire (PQ), and the Faculty Position Vacancy form adequate for personnel planning in the proposal?
Comments: _____ ___ ___

19. Is the "Proposal Analysis Form" an adequate final internal planning document?
Comments: _____ ___ ___

20. Are relationships with funding agencies clearly expressed and defined in this sequence?
Comments: _____ ___ ___

* * * *

Please use the space below to record any further comments which you may have as a user of the Grants Planning Submission Sub-system (GPSS). Attach any form revisions which you think would improve the system.

GRANTS PLANNING SUBMISSION SUB-SYSTEM EVALUATION

FORM B - SUPPORT SERVICES SURVEY

Name _____ Location: District ____
Eastern ____
Metro ____
Western ____

Position: Faculty ____
Administrator ____
Support Staff ____

Please read each of the following statements carefully and refer to the following sections in the attached interim procedures for the submission of grant and contract applications:

Mark an "X" by the response that best describes your answer to the question. Include comments to expand your answer if necessary. There are four flow charts for segments of the process. Two DELTA charts indicate the over-all sub-system in summary. Functional responsibility charts detail activities.

---

1. Is your responsibility clearly expressed and defined in this sequence?

Yes No

Comments: _____ ___ ___

2. Is the amount of time given under "Activity Duration" adequate to complete each of the activities in the sequence?

Comments: _____ ___ ___

3. Are all activities related to your responsibility in the sequence necessary?

Comments: _____ ___ ___

4. Are your activities related to the quality of the resultant proposal?

Comments: _____ ___ ___

5. Are your activities related only to administration and not to the resultant proposal?

Comments: _____ ___ ___

6. Is campus-wide planning value apparent in this sequence?

Comments: _____ ___ ___

Yes No

7. Is district-wide planning value apparent in this sequence?

   Comments: _____ ___

8. Are the documents related to your responsibilities and activities adequate planning documents? (See Appendix of Documents)

   Comments and suggestions: _____ ___

9. Do you wish to participate in planning and conferences early in proposal development so that you better understand your responsibility as related to the resultant project?

   Comments: _____ ___

10. Do you consider assisting in special project planning for grants and contracts part of your position responsibility?

    Comments: _____ ___

* * *

Please use the space below to record any further comments which you may have as a support service of the Grants Planning Submission Sub-system (GPSS). Attach any form revisions which you think would improve the system.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 18 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES